

12-5-6

Israel class it is the only country threatened
with destruction (if moves)

But wait - Is there any w.
moves (if Israel knows how to develop moves)

US, believe:

(about)
Munich, - from by efforts closer to
destroy to, if not it destroyed

But don't have the

(and, as evolution the natural to
get the, though the one was a
course that all give the
the up to down the,

(on Holocaust: Are there not German
troops, officers, who confess, candidly,
personal participation in gas chamber ops

+ supplies of gasolene B

Living Corps

In other, legitimate business
(not for inspired Charles) (photos)
PHOTOS

Whereas, no does the linking Hitler.

Feeling? Explain? other?

[on other hand: do anti- find all link in
Holocaust?

How far do they go into Postwar?

What is the social position of Israel in US

12-13-06

Israel (US) position on Iran -

We will not allow ~~Iran~~ ^{Iran} with attack
on Iran's ^U-enrichment process, with or
without inspection (although under NPT,
IAEA, int. law, it is allowed to have U-enrichment
process with inspection)

(and ^{NNWS} X-centris have it, X-I without
inspection; and US ~~was~~ proposed it to
Shah, in 1977?)

I & US will attack Iran if necessary to
prevent it - with nuclear weapons if needed

[i.e. we are using our nukes now
to protect our oil monopoly in ME;
we are using nukes to deter Iran from
beginning the option - with inspection, under the
NPT (but...? option?) - of having the NPT
subsequently not requiring nukes.

(i.e. ^{the} announcing its intention to begin
nukes, a year or two? in advance. (or several years).
[from 5% to 80-95% for several weeks take how long?])

(C/A: there is no strong evidence ("proof") of
Iranian intentions that are not ^{or plausible} compatible with
the intention to have the option (within a year or
two of decision) of beginning, with the intention
of expectation of doing so within a particular
period.

with inspection, it can't do this secretly.

Without inspection, it can.

^{doctor}
Bashiri was attacked by Iraq
during war

Is. leadership is low quality -

Iran are supporting fundamentalist leaders
in Hamas - and approval of Hezbollah in
Lebanon

Is. supported Iraq War

Is will not act on its ~~own~~ own

Iran's security problem must be taken
into the picture

If Musharraf were shot Terrorism
New generation of generals are ~~the~~
Wahabis from madrassas

Is. fears:

Iran. concerns are the Arabs - 1000 years

1980-88 Arabs
attack

Iran US, UK, Russia

✓ Saleh bin Laden: his personal enemy is Iraqi nuclear
ambitions, of US leaves - Iraq, sending
Iraqi Arabs, wanting revenge -
a South-type Jew again (otherwise a
Semi-Skin) — and way to restore Iraq
but means

Work with the Arabs — not the Iranians
(King of Jordan from a "crescent of Shia")

Syria, maybe

US security guarantees

Iran on Afghan

Al Qaeda prison

don't bother with regime change

very tough negotiator: established protocol (+)
(talked in Afgh)

in Oct, we are interested

are B+C "mod"? —

"total lack of strategic overview"

Condi Rice, Dick Bush, Cheney...

^{we}
(make deal with Iran — half cash
refugees — brain-drain

if
if don't bother about half. cooperation

mislead the whole community of NNWS

dismantle the NPT —

Can. will vote in favor

US breaking rules of dealing rec. tied to
Brazil, Argentina, Egypt, Iran,
Japan, South Korea

China will sell to Pakistan,
(offshore Iran)

Congress has not even requested India
to sign treaty here

13-13-C

12-11-06 E. Am. Iran will not give up, in agents⁽²⁾ of
without attack, enrichment under inspection.

Alternatives:

1) — with instruments

It would accept heavy inspection,
(no regime change, ^{of US} assurance of no attack, normal
relations... Regime change of Iran — brief:
(vs. Chaudhury)

~~alternatives~~

— At present, IAEA inspection (inadequate)

— Sanctions, blockade — no inspection — crash program (?)
— will not cause suspension

for

— attack: ritual, not

— or US " (resumed no-inspection crash program
after 4 months...)

state of
war

No resumption of inspection

(Iran gets bomb, Iran with nuclear bomb?)

No regime change

4)

Hyp: Israel has given up (yesterday, about 12-12-06;
Khatami, last week) its "obligation" — at cost of
exp. continuity for. unhelpful to Is/US demand that
Iran not begin to join it —

(What threats will be made — by who — if Egypt
now decides to enrich? (in view of India-US deal?)

Want a summit — the Half States have "joint
decision" to convene: 12-10-06

Then, US position on Iran, + India deal (both
supported by Dem leaders (pro-Israel), i.e. Kerry — (Obama?)
have destroyed NPT [or, will IAEA inspection continue?]

12-13-06

to/US thinks will not cause fear
suspension of immigrant, and have been
& will be counter-productive

entirely negative, except
to increase (for to-) the chance of a US attack.

An attack - to or US - will be disastrous,
esp. nuclear attack (catastrophe, though not the
ultimate catastrophe: but one proof & use of
all kinds, untoppable

(Abolition - and on the way to it - radical
reduction of danger (S-R + international law) -
inc. no more actual proof
are not impossible, "waterworks," as of
now (though there is almost no recent
or foreseeable (S-R) progress toward it, with
the contrary, strong movement away from it). -

es. Kruger but both could (soon, and quickly) become
unattainable

(like German democracy after Feb 28 - for 1933

and, recently, war - even defeat, and
destruction, unless Adolf SU were not involved,
i.e. Hitler was assass.

(Here, in 2000: no mission of long, from (?)

(and less chance of 9-11:

NO ONE NOTICES THIS!)

12-13-06

So, jobs say? fund state will with
if Iran has, an inspired, a U-embell
process? Iran will leave, wait come. Bad.

(no, mess - but this 5-10 years off, give inspiration
only? ?

avoid that by new rule policy worldwide -
but of US.

// Will Iran come to US, or stay,
AFTER ISRAEL ATTACK ON IRAN?
Will Israel - of US - be more, or less, safe after that?
(expect Iran long)

What if all Arab states have mess? + immediately,
Can US prevent this? process!

Effect of attack, if it on US:

Is it the only US off - ME.

OK for US?

Not in interests of US!

High oil prices -

OK for oil carp, in S-R!

How long, and?

12-14-06

Is - Iran

Bush doesn't need persuasion as to
thinks to attack Iran

he needs reasons to sell to Pentagon
+ Congress

Obama is giving him that

Why does he want it now - within
2 years (1 year)?

GWB (Hawk):

"only I..."

(Hill)

+ Cheney

Hyp: If agree with GWB - he is the
man of destiny needed to attack Iran
(as, Iraq) - no successor, can be controlled
as to do it, is next 5-10 years
(~~that~~ Iran does have a nuke -
like SA, if sanctions were lifted)

If "my" wants Iran to (be provoked by Bush to)
leave NPT - so they can convince US they
as US must attack

CHAK to Soviet as reply to it in '73:
(Khrushchev)

Is + Iran (+ AQ!) get US to destroy Bosnia region
in Iraq

Is Is (will AQ help?!) gets US to attack
Iran (see End of The Departed).

2, 12-13-06

to "involvement" of our cap + will to use it
(preventively)

is aimed at, to influence, US.

(perhaps then - it won't work - by
increasing its expectation of US
attack: instead of this,
"US won't let so. attack."

1) to make more credible, US concern,
"if we don't then (with B-2's, etc.)
so. will attack with ares."

(Bush might not mind that - + might want
to use US ares! - but sort of Estor
(non-finish or Christian point) would not.

So then give Bush a public rationale (better
than a private warning - as in 1973?!) which
led up to US supply, which forced us
public resistance) (did it risk war with SU?
surely?!)
for attacking Iran - make it easier to do,
politically, and harder to resist doing it

- "If we don't, so. will attack with ares."
"don't"

4. 12-13-66

to prevent forced from one attack on Iran
In this context, it will be harder for US
to control areas, ^{on Iran} even as ESC
- main point was to avoid areas.

Good; but it looks a non-live attack more
likely.

(not show all the value of being aware of a
"Lowest Option.")

and it recapit US view of legitimacy of things.
There, perhaps - at least - a two - and on the.

and most devastatingly influential
When I count the US as the chief sinner
on nuclear dangers, followed closely, in tone + scale, by
the SU/Russia

(all other NWS are very behind, viz. France,
no worse than any other, no less "entitled" to
use EU "defense" or deter the enemy...

(If France did get over, so would certainly
be entitled (in count world) — an well-advanced —
to keep them, or get them if it didn't have them

— (no new action to declare them would be necessary
to deter — from know...)

Declaration now is to convince so. is not
so afraid of world opinion or the Arab response
as to be inhibited from coming out its count
threats against them: of a nuclear Osirag
strike: (would against Natory).

"If you (US), don't ~~to~~ proceed at "defence" (threats)
(without recognizing them?!)
or assuring it!)

so ~~to~~ do what you can do to stop it (without
nukes) we will do what we have to do to
stop it — with nukes.)

(Ask: does France have any chance of
detering Natory without nukes?
(US does.)

French
and to
ambiguity
(not quite!)